

CHAPTER 5

Plan Implementation

5.1 Plan Implementation

The SR 19/ SR 20 Corridor Plan identified twenty-one Tier 1, 11 Tier 2, 4 Tier 3 projects, and sixteen TDM strategies that are needed to meet the corridor vision. With prevailing economic conditions, the available revenue needed to implement these improvements is very limited and cannot fund all of the projects in the near term. To assist with the implementation of the improvements, an action matrix was developed by the project team based on the guidelines outlined in WSDOT's 2007 Planning Studies Guidelines and Criteria Report. This action matrix, as presented in Tables 5-1, 5-2 and 5-3 lists the project by their priority and classifies them in terms of the Washington Transportation Guidelines and the Highway System Plan implementation strategies.

Priority ¹ Ranking	State Route	Recommendation	WTP Investment Guideline P=Preservation S=Safety EV=Econ. Vitality M=Mobility EQ=Environ. Qual.	HSP Implementation 1 = Tier 1 2 = Tier 2 3 = Tier 3	Estimated Cost Range 2009 (\$-millions) ²	Funding Source	Funding Programmed (Biennium)	Agency responsible for securing funding	Partners/ Resources
1	20	SR 20/Kearney Street Intersection Control	M/S	1	\$0.9 to \$1.3	TBD	TBD	TBD	City of Port Townsend, WSDOT
1	20	SR 20/Port Townsend Entryway Study (Discovery-Mill/Jacob Miller Vicinity)	M/S/EV	1	\$0.5 to \$0.6	TBD	TBD	TBD	Jefferson County, City of Port Townsend, WSDOT
1	19/20	SR 19 and SR 20 Intersection Control	M/S	2	\$2.2 to \$2.9	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
1	19	SR 19/Prospect Ave. Intersection Control	M/S/EV	1	\$1.2 to \$1.5	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
1	19	SR 19/Irondale Rd Intersection Control	M/S	1	\$1.5 to \$2.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
1	19	SR 19/SR 116 Intersection Control	M/S	2	\$3.6 to \$4.8	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
1	19	SR 19/West Valley Rd Intersection Control	M/S	1	\$2.1 to \$2.8	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
1	19	SR 19/SR 104 Phase 1 Undercrossing	M/S	2	\$7.5 to \$10.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County

¹Projects of Special Interest were identified through a stakeholder and public involvement process. These projects resonated with the community and received the most interest and support. They are not ranked within themselves but listed based on their location from north to south. They can be regarded as all tied for priority ranking 1. Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 list of recommendations are ranked together. Travel Demand Management (TDM) strategies are not ranked but important stakeholder recommendations that may also be part of the tier system, and are typically low cost solutions with lower environmental impacts.

²The preliminary project costs are for planning purposes only. The preliminary project costs are in 2009 dollars, are planning level, and are not based on engineering analysis. They do not account for potential environmental mitigation (including right of way), rising material costs, or other unforeseen expenditures that may occur during design or construction. Also unknown utility relocation or undergrounding of utilities will increase the costs. These factors may increase the final costs of individual projects.

Table 5-1: Projects of Special Interest Implementation Action Matrix

Priority ¹ Ranking for Tier 1, 2, & 3 (Priority with all scores)	State Route	Recommendation	WTP Investment Guideline P=Preservation S=Safety EV=Econ. Vitality M=Mobility EQ=Environ. Qual.	HSP Implementation 1 = Tier 1 2 = Tier 2 3 = Tier 3	Estimated Cost Range 2009 (\$-millions) ²	Funding Source	Funding Programmed (Biennium)	Agency responsible for securing funding	Partners/ Resources
1 (1)	19	SR 19/Prospect Ave Intersection Control	M/S/EV	1	\$1.2 to \$1.5	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
2 (2)	20	SR 20/Kearney Streets Intersection Control	M/S	1	\$0.9 to \$1.3	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, City of Port Townsend
3 (3)	19	SR 19/Chimacum- Center Intersection Control	M/S	1	\$2.1 to \$2.7	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
4 (3)	19	SR 19/West Valley Rd Intersection Control	M/S	1	\$2.1 to \$2.8	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
5 (4)	19	SR 19/Oak Bay Road Channelization	M/S	1	\$0.9 to \$1.2	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
6 (5)	19	SR 19/Irondale Road Intersection Control	M/S	1	\$1.5 to \$2.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
7 (5)	20	SR 20/Seton or Fredricks Street Intersection Control	M/S/EV	1	\$1.3 to \$1.8	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
8 (6)	20	SR 20/Haines Place Intersection Control	M/S	1	\$1.2 to \$1.6	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, City of Port Townsend
9 (7)	19	SR 19/Anderson Lake Channelization	M/S	1	\$2.0 to \$2.7	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
10 (8)	20	SR 20/Port Townsend Entryway Study	M/S/EV	1	\$0.4 to \$0.6	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, City of Port Townsend, Jefferson County

Table 5-2: Tier 1, 2, & 3 Implementation Action Matrix

Priority ¹ Ranking for Tier 1, 2, & 3 (Priority with all scores)	State Route	Recommendation	WTP Investment Guideline P=Preservation S=Safety EV=Econ. Vitality M=Mobility EQ=Environ. Qual.	HSP Implementation 1 = Tier 1 2 = Tier 2 3 = Tier 3	Estimated Cost Range 2009 (\$-millions) ²	Funding Source	Funding Programmed (Biennium)	Agency responsible for securing funding	Partners/ Resources
11 (8)	19	SR 19/H.J. Carroll Park Channelization	M/S	1	\$1.0 to \$1.3	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
12 (8)	20	SR 20/Port Townsend Entryway Intersection Control (Realignment of Mill)	M/S/EV	2 or 3	\$7.2 to \$9.6	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, City of Port Townsend, Jefferson County
13 (8)	19	SR 19/SR 116 Intersection Control	M/S	2	\$3.6 to \$4.8	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
14 (9)	20	SR 20/Sheridan Street Intersection Control and WB Climbing Lane	M/S	2	\$1.5 to \$1.9	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, City of Port Townsend
15 (10)	19	SR 19/Airport-Woodland Drive Intersection Control	M/S/EV	1	\$2.2 to \$3.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
16 (10)	20	SR 20/Thomas Street* Intersection Control	M/S	2	\$4.0 to \$5.3	Various	2009-11	City of Port Townsend	City of Port Townsend, WSDOT
17 (11)	19 & 20	SR 19 and SR 20 Intersection Control	M/S	2	\$2.2 to \$2.9	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
18 (12)	19	SR 19/SR 104 Phase 2 Flyover Ramp or Interchange	M/S	3	\$34.7-\$46.3	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
19 (13)	20	SR 20/Fredricks Street Channelization	S/EV	1	\$0.9 to \$1.2	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
20 (13)	20	SR 20/12 th Avenue Channelization	M/S	1	\$0.2 to \$0.3	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, City of Port Townsend

*Single lane roundabout under construction/constructed

Table 5-2: Tier 1, 2, & 3 Implementation Action Matrix

Priority ¹ Ranking for Tier 1, 2, & 3 (Priority with all scores)	State Route	Recommendation	WTP Investment Guideline P=Preservation S=Safety EV=Econ. Vitality M=Mobility EQ=Environ. Qual.	HSP Implementation 1 = Tier 1 2 = Tier 2 3 = Tier 3	Estimated Cost Range 2009 (\$-millions) ²	Funding Source	Funding Programmed (Biennium)	Agency responsible for securing funding	Partners/ Resources
21 (14)	19	SR 19/Egg & I Road Channelization	M/S	1	\$2.2 to \$3.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, City of Port Townsend
22 (14)	19	SR 19/SR 104 Phase 1 ("J" shaped SR 104 Undercrossing)	M/S	2	\$7.5 to \$10.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
23 (14)	19	SR 19/SR 104 Auxiliary Lane (TWLTL on SR 19)	M/S/EV	2	\$1.2 to \$1.6	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
24 (14)	20	SR 20/Howard Street* Intersection Control	M/S	2	\$4.0 to \$5.3	Various	2009-11	City of Port Townsend	City of Port Townsend, WSDOT
25 (15)	20	SR 20/Old Fort Townsend Channelization	M/S	1	\$0.3 to \$0.4	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
26 (15)	20	SR 20/Discovery – Mill to Washington Street Segment 5 – Widening to 4-Lanes or reducing demand through development of parallel corridors	M/S	3	\$32.2-\$42.9	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, City of Port Townsend
27 (16)	19	SR 19/Larson Lake Rd Channelization	M/S	1	\$2.4 to \$3.1	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
28 (16)	19	SR 19/Parkridge Drive Channelization	M/S	1	\$1.1 to \$1.5	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
29 (16)	20	SR 20/Jacob Miller Rd Channelization	M/S	1	\$0.5 to \$0.6	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
30 (17)	19	SR 19/ Segment 1 (SR 104 to Chimacum – Center) Pullouts	M/S	2	\$0.2 to \$0.3	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County

**Single lane roundabout under construction/constructed

Table 5-2: Tier 1, 2, & 3 Implementation Action Matrix

Priority ¹ Ranking for Tier 1, 2, & 3 (Priority with all scores)	State Route	Recommendation	WTP Investment Guideline P=Preservation S=Safety EV=Econ. Vitality M=Mobility EQ=Environ. Qual.	HSP Implementation 1 = Tier 1 2 = Tier 2 3 = Tier 3	Estimated Cost Range 2009 (\$-millions) ²	Funding Source	Funding Programmed (Biennium)	Agency responsible for securing funding	Partners/ Resources
0.45	19	SR 19/Belfage Road to Larson Lake Road Passing Lane	M/S	2	\$4.4 to \$5.8	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
32 (19)	19	SR 19/Swansonville Rd Channelization	M/S	1	\$4.0 to \$5.3	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
33 (19)	19	SR 19/Four Corners Rd Channelization	M/S	1	\$0.5 to \$0.7	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
34 (19)	20	SR 20/SR 19 to Discovery – Mill Segment 4 Widening to Divided 4-Lanes	M/S	3	\$22.4-\$29.9	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
35 (20)	19	SR 19/Prospect Avenue to Theater Road Passing Lane	M/S	2	\$5.3 to \$7.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
36 (21)	19	SR 19/SR 116 to SR 20 Segment 3 Widening to 4-Lanes	M/S	3	\$72.4-\$96.6	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County

¹Tiered recommendations are also ranked separately. Thus Tier 1 has a priority ranking 1 project, Tier 2 has a priority ranking 1 project, and so too for Tier 3. Travel Demand Management (TDM) projects are not ranked but important stakeholder recommendations that may also be part of the tier system, and are typically low cost solutions with lower environmental projects.

²The preliminary project costs are for planning purposes only. The preliminary project costs are in 2009 dollars, are planning level, and are not based on engineering analysis. They do not account for potential environmental mitigation (including right of way), rising material costs, or other unforeseen expenditures that may occur during design or construction. Also unknown utility relocation or undergrounding of utilities will increase the costs. These factors may increase the final costs of individual projects.

Table 5-2: Tier 1, 2, & 3 Implementation Action Matrix

Priority ¹ Ranking for ITS & TDM (Priority based on lowest cost)	State Route	Recommendation	WTP Investment Guideline P=Preservation S=Safety EV=Econ. Vitality M=Mobility EQ=Environ. Qual.	HSP Implementation 1 = Tier 1 2 = Tier 2 3 = Tier 3	Estimated Cost Range 2009 (\$-millions) ²	Funding Source	Funding Programmed (Biennium)	Agency responsible for securing funding	Partners/ Resources
NR	19	ITS: Highway Advisory Radio (HAR) signs and transmitter in vicinity of Chimacum-Center	M/S	1	\$0.06 - \$0.08	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT
NR	20	ITS: Highway Advisory Radio (HAR) signs and transmitter in vicinity of SR 19/SR 20	M/S	1	\$0.06 - \$0.08	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT
NR	19	ITS: Roadway Weather Information System (RWIS) in vicinity of SR 19/SR 104	M/S	1	\$0.07 - \$0.09	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT
NR	19	TDM: Transit stop at W. Patison Street	M/S	1	\$0.10 - \$0.13	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson Transit
NR	19	TDM: Access Management to combine access with transit stop at Theater Road	M/S	1	\$0.10 - \$0.13	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson Transit
NR	20	TDM: Transit stop at Old Fort Townsend Rd	M/S	1	\$0.10 - \$0.13	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson Transit
NR	19 & 20	TDM: Feasibility Study for alternative transportation choices program	M/EV	1	\$0.1 to \$0.12	TBD	TBD	TBD	Jefferson County or Others
NR	20	TDM: Pedestrian mid-block crossing in hospital district near Sheridan	M/S	1	\$0.12 - \$0.16	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson Transit

Table 5-3: TDM & ITS Implementation Action Matrix

Priority ¹ Ranking for Tier 1 (Priority based on lowest cost)	State Route	Recommendation	WTP Investment Guideline P=Preservation S=Safety EV=Econ. Vitality M=Mobility EQ=Environ. Qual.	HSP Implementation 1 = Tier 1 2 = Tier 2 3 = Tier 3	Estimated Cost Range 2009 (\$-millions) ²	Funding Source	Funding Programmed (Biennium)	Agency responsible for securing funding	Partners/ Resources
NR	20	TDM: Transit stop at Fredricks Street	M/S	1	\$0.13 - \$0.17	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson Transit
NR	19	TDM: Chimacum – Center park and ride lot (20-stalls)	M	1	\$0.48 - \$0.63	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson Transit
NR	19	TDM: Pedestrian trail between West Valley and H.J. Carroll Park with at-grade crossings	M/S	1	\$0.60 - \$0.80	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
NR	19	TDM: Improve 40-stall visitor center/park and ride lot at SR 19/SR 104	M	1	\$0.65-\$0.86	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson Transit
NR	19	TDM: SR 116 park and ride lot (40 stalls)	M	1	\$0.95 - \$1.3	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson Transit
NR	19 & 20	TDM: Implementation of a 3-year alternative transportation choices program	M/EV	1	\$1.2 - \$1.6	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, City of Port Townsend, Jefferson County
NR	19 & 20	TDM: Pedestrian trail between Kala Point and Glen Cove (Through Courtesy Ford Vicinity)	M/S	1	\$1.6 - \$2.1	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County

Table 5-3: TDM & ITS Implementation Action Matrix

Priority ¹ Ranking for Tier 1 (Priority based on lowest cost)	State Route	Recommendation	WTP Investment Guideline P=Preservation S=Safety EV=Econ. Vitality M=Mobility EQ=Environ. Qual.	HSP Implementation 1 = Tier 1 2 = Tier 2 3 = Tier 3	Estimated Cost Range 2009 (\$-millions) ²	Funding Source	Funding Programmed (Biennium)	Agency responsible for securing funding	Partners/ Resources
NR	19	TDM: Shoulder widening between Chimacum-Center and West Valley (or Sidewalks)	M/S	1	\$3.1 - \$4.1	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County
NR	20	TDM: Complete discontinuous sidewalks between Grant and Jefferson in Port Townsend	M/S	1	\$3.4 to \$4.5	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, City of Port Townsend
NR	19	TDM: Access management between Hilda Street and Irondale (Sidewalks in Urban Growth Area)	M/S/EV	1	\$3.7 -\$4.9	TBD	TBD	TBD	WSDOT, Jefferson County

¹Travel Demand Management (TDM) projects are not ranked (NR) but important stakeholder recommendations that may also be part of the tier system, and are typically low cost solutions with lower environmental projects.

²The preliminary project costs are for planning purposes only. The preliminary project costs are in 2009 dollars, are planning level, and are not based on engineering analysis. They do not account for potential environmental mitigation (including right of way), rising material costs, or other unforeseen expenditures that may occur during design or construction. Also unknown utility relocation or undergrounding of utilities will increase the costs. These factors may increase the final costs of individual projects.

Table 5-3: TDM & ITS Implementation Action Matrix

Page 3 of 3

5.2 Highway System Plan

The Washington State Highway System Plan (HSP) is the state highway component of the Washington State Multimodal Transportation Plan (SMTP). The SMTP is the state's overall transportation plan that will include an analysis of facilities the state owns and those in which the state has an interest. The HSP is updated every two years and serves as the basis for the six-year highway program and the two-year biennial budget request to the State Legislature. WSDOT is dedicated to delivering an HSP that implements the Legislature's goals. This is accomplished through the coordination and integration of specific components from many statewide modal and program plans. The HSP is also aligned to the Washington Transportation Plan (WTP), which outlines the policies adopted by the Washington State Transportation Commission.

This corridor plan is meant to update, support and help refine the highway system plan.

5.3 Developer Participation

Developers can participate in improvements to mitigate impacts on a pro-rata share basis (rough proportion based upon new traffic added) if there is a project programmed within 6-years. When a development would degrade a facility's LOS below an applicable threshold, the facility would be considered deficient to support the development, and WSDOT and its partners would seek mitigation of traffic impacts. Mitigation can take the form of development constraints (for example, the appropriate placement of highway access points), developer constructed transportation improvements, or developer financial contribution to transportation improvements constructed by others. The plan recommendations provide possible improvements along the corridor. For example, channelization could be funded as development occurs and traffic mitigation is obtained through the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA).

5.4 Grants

City, county, transit, and others may choose to apply for grants to implement projects recommended in this corridor study. Citation of study recommendations in the grant application could strengthen the application.

5.5 Legislature/ Legislative Funding

Another means of funding and implementing corridor plan recommendations is through legislative funding. Congressional delegates could choose to line-item a project that provides safety, congestion, economic, or other benefits that meet community needs. Study findings and recommendations in support of projects help to demonstrate the need and endorse the solution. Moreover, since the plan is developed through a public process, stakeholder and community support is behind the recommendations.

5.6 Next Steps

The SR 19/SR 20 Corridor Planning Study identifies corridor needs that are based on adopted Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) thresholds and proposes actions to address those needs. While this alone does not guarantee implementation funding, the plan allows future consideration for funding requests to be focused on areas of greatest need in this corridor. These identified areas will compete with other similar locations around the state for future funding based on performance outcome.

Available revenue to implement the identified improvements is very limited. Specific actions that should be taken to position the corridor plan proposed improvements for future implementation include:

- Incorporate the SR 19/SR 20 Corridor Plan recommended improvements in the State's Highway System Plan (HSP) and the Peninsula Regional Transportation Organization's (PRTPO) regional transportation plan.
- Incorporate the SR 19/SR 20 Corridor Plan recommended improvements, as appropriate, in county and city comprehensive plans.